UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

2

1

3 | SKYTEC, INC.,

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

1213

1415

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24

25

26

No. 3:15-CV-02104-BJM

Plaintiff,

LOGISTIC SYSTEMS, INC.,

v.

Defendant.

The Honorable Bruce J. McGiverin

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY THE PROCEEDINGS

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

On September 12, 2018, Plaintiff Skytec, Inc. ("Plaintiff" or "Skytec") filed a voluntary petition (the "Petition") for relief under chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §§ 101–1532, the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the District of Puerto Rico (the "Bankruptcy Court"). *See In re Skytec, Inc.*, Case No. 18-05288-11 (Bankr. D.P.R. Sept. 12, 2018) (the "Bankruptcy Case"). Approximately one hour later, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Stay the Proceedings (the "Motion") before this Court in the above-captioned case. The Motion requests two distinct remedies: first, to stay the instant case because of Plaintiff's filing of its bankruptcy petition, and second, to allow Plaintiff's counsel to withdraw from the representation due to an alleged conflict of interest. Dkt. 164. Defendant-Counterclaimant Logistic Systems, Inc. ("LogiSYS") hereby responds to Plaintiff's Motion as directed by the Court. Dkt. 165.

Plaintiff's filing of the Petition operates as an automatic stay of this proceeding. In particular, § 362(a)(1) of the Bankruptcy Code prohibits "the commencement or continuation . . . of a judicial, administrative, or other action or proceeding against the debtor that was or could

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY - 1 Case No. 3:15-CV-02104-BJM

53147472.4

have been commenced before the commencement of the [debtor's] case under [the Bankruptcy Code], or to recover a claim against a debtor that arose before the commencement of the [debtor's] case under [the Bankruptcy Code]." 11 U.S.C. § 362(a)(1); see also Whitman-Nieves v. P.R. Fed. Credit Union (In re Whitman-Nieves), 549 B.R. 440, 444 (Bankr. D.P.R. 2016) (comparing sections 362(a)(1) and 362(a)(6) of the Bankruptcy Code). The automatic stay remains in effect as to all matters subject to the stay, unless and until an order granting relief from the stay is obtained from the Bankruptcy Court, and renders any judicial orders obtained in violation of the stay void. See Soares v. Brockton Credit Union (In re Soares), 107 F.3d 969, 976 (1st Cir. 1997) (explaining that the automatic stay "remains in force until a federal court either disposes of the case . . . or lifts the stay" and holding that acts taken in contravention of the automatic stay are void). .

Accordingly, in the absence of an order from the Bankruptcy granting relief from the stay, any action taken in this case that could be considered against the interest of the Skytec as a debtor-in-possession is automatically stayed. Such action includes the request by Skytec's counsel to withdraw from representing Skytec, or any order further thereto, in the instant case.

Moreover, withdrawal of Skytec's counsel may not be necessary or proper, notwithstanding the inclusion of Skytec's counsel on Skytec's list of unsecured creditors filed in the Bankruptcy Case. Bankruptcy courts have allowed the continuing representation by prior litigation counsel of a debtor, subject to specific disclosures and waivers from creditors and the United State Trustee. See Stoumbos v. Kilimnik, 988 F.2d 949, 964 (9th Cir. 1993) ("Section

¹ The amount listed in Debtor's preliminary schedules as owed to law firm Cancio, Nadal Rivera & Diaz, PSC (*see* Bankruptcy Case [ECF No. 1]) is not substantial in comparison to the work performed, the time invested in litigation and the pending matters in the herein stayed

21

22

23

24

25

26

327(c) allows the appointment of counsel to represent the [debtor-in-possession], even where counsel represents a creditor, where the court finds no 'actual conflict of interest.'"); accord Barroso Herrans v. Lugo Mender, 364 B.R. 463, 481 (D.P.R. 2006) (explaining that bankruptcy judges, in their discretion, must determine whether the is a conflict of interest case-by-case, based on "the particular facts and circumstances of the case.") (citing *In re Martin*, 817 F.2d 175, 182 (1st Cir. 1987); In re AroChem Corp., 176 F.3d 610, 621 (2nd Cir. 1999)) ("[W]here the interest of the special counsel and the interest of the estate are identical with respect to the matter for which special counsel is retained, there is no conflict and the representation can stand.").

LogiSYS respectfully submits that, absent an order from the Bankruptcy Court granting relief from the automatic stay, this Honorable Court is precluded from entertaining Skytec's counsel's request to withdraw from representing Skytec in this proceeding because this proceeding was and remains automatically stayed upon the filing of Skytec's Petition. While LogiSYS does not contest the notice of automatic stay, it respectfully requests this Honorable Court refrain from entertaining the request that Skytec's counsel be permitted to withdraw.

proceeding. Therefore, to grant their withdrawal of representation in this proceeding before obtaining relief from stay from the Bankruptcy Court may not necessarily be in the best interests of Skytec's bankruptcy estate or its creditors. Such a determination is appropriately left to the discretion of the Bankruptcy Court in connection with a motion for relief from stay or application for retention of professionals by the debtor in in the Bankruptcy Case under applicable provisions of the Bankruptcy Code.

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY - 3 Case No. 3:15-CV-02104-BJM

1	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 14th day of September, 2018.
2	
3	<u>s/ Carlos A. Rodriguez Vidal</u> Carlos A. Rodríguez Vidal
4	USDC PR 201213 Counsel for Logistic Systems, Inc.
5	Goldman Antonetti & Cordova, LLC
6	Post Office Box 70364 San Juan, PR 00936-8364
7	Crodriguez-vidal@gaclaw.com
8	s/ Samuel T. Bull
9	<u>s/ Lauren J. King</u> <u>s/ Kelly Mennemeier</u>
	Sam T. Bull
10	Washington State Bar No.: 34387
11	Lauren King Washington State Bar No.: 40939
12	Kelly Mennemeier
	Washington State Bar No.: 51838
13	Pro Hac Vice Counsel for Logistic Systems, Inc.
14	1111 Third Ave. Suite 3000
15	Seattle, WA 98101 Sam.Bull@foster.com
16	Lauren.King@foster.com
	Kelly.Mennemeier@foster.com
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY - 4 Case No. 3:15-CV-02104-BJM

1 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 2 The undersigned hereby certify that on September 14, 2018 the foregoing document was 3 electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send 4 notification of such filing to all counsel of record. 5 Dated this 14th day of September, 2018 in San Juan, Puerto Rico. 6 7 s/ Carlos A. Rodriguez Vidal Carlos A. Rodríguez-Vidal 8 USDC PR 201213 9 Counsel for Logistic Systems, Inc. Goldman Antonetti & Cordova, LLC 10 Post Office Box 70364 San Juan, PR 00936-8364 11 Crodriguez-vidal@gaclaw.com 12 s/ Samuel T. Bull 13 s/ Lauren J. King s/ Kelly Mennemeier 14 Samuel T. Bull Washington State Bar No. 34387 15 Lauren King Washington State Bar No. 40939 16 Kelly Mennemeier 17 Washington State Bar No. 51838 Pro Hac Vice Counsel for Logistic Systems, 18 Inc. 1111 Third Ave. Suite 3400 19 Seattle, WA 98101 Sam.Bull@foster.com 20 Lauren.King@foster.com 21 Kelly.Mennemeier@foster.com 22 23 24 25 26 DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY - 5 Case No. 3:15-CV-02104-BJM